



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

Two American scholars, Dr. D. H. HOLMES and Dr. F. L. VAN CLEEF, have done good service to the study of the Attic Orators, the one by his *Index Lysiacus*, the other by his *Index Antiphonteus*. Dr. Holmes's *Index* is an index pure and simple, and undertakes to give every word in Lysias according to Scheibe's edition, obsolete ι subscript and all. The only omissions are $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ and the forms of the article. Dr. VAN CLEEF does very much more for Antiphon, and groups the facts about syntactical centres. It is true that syntactical grouping is not altogether lacking in Dr. HOLMES's *Index*. So the prepositions appear according to the cases with which they are construed. $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ shows its moods and so do $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ and $\theta\pi\omega\varsigma$, and under $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$ we learn when the finite verb is used and when the infinitive. But $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ we should have to look up and $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ likewise. Still, a detailed index like Dr. VAN CLEEF's lay outside of Dr. HOLMES's plan, and we must be thankful for what we have received. Those who wish to get to the bottom of things would have to verify the arrangement themselves, at any rate, and the main thing is the accuracy of the index, which seems to be assured by Dr. Holmes's method, which involves the careful copying of the entire text and the careful checking of every example. The two orators here indexed represent the two poles of oratorical style, and the $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\delta\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$ and the $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\iota\sigma\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$ are stamped on the long columns of words and the long rows of figures. Very instructive is the comparison of the vocabulary of the two authors. The range is very different, determined, it is true, in part by the character of the themes, because we should naturally expect a higher range for an orator like Antiphon, who has to do with tragic subjects alone—such subjects as justify the use of $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ —but partly also by stylistic ideals. So the large number of verbal nouns would of itself suffice to mark the $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ of the earlier orator. The verb is not suffered to remain as a simple act, the moral responsibility of the doer, the dread irrevocableness of the deed must be emphasized. Hence the frequent periphrasis with $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ which Thukydidean scholars have not been slow to point out, though some of them have been slow to see the significance of it. Nor is the relative frequency of $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ without interest. Whatever else is uncertain about $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$, certain it is that $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ belongs to a higher sphere, as Tycho Mommsen noted long ago (*Beiträge*², 667). $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon$ is as rare as $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is familiar. Only we must not be too quick in drawing an inference as to the character of the will of the easy-going Homeric gods—the $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$ $\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota\alpha$ $\zeta\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. In Homer $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ preponderates, an old story which has recently been emphasized by Mr. HIGGINS in the *Classical Review* for Nov. 1895. In Pindar $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ occurs but once in a fragment. With the incoming of prose $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ retreats. A glance at VON ESSEN's *Index Thucydideus*, a glance at DUNBAR's *Concordance of Aris-*

tophanes will show the state of things. Counting is needless. Antiphon, according to Van Cleef's Index, has 38 ἐθέλω's against 36 βούλομαι's. Lysias has about 50 ἐθέλω's and about 172 βούλομαι's. Mr. Higgins's count (l. c.) gives for Homer 294 ἐθέλω's and 38 βούλομαι's. In the same paper Mr. Higgins calls attention to the parts of the verse in which the two occur, but, of course, that is largely a matter of metre. The only forms of ἐθέλω that could stand first in the line are the augmented imperfects, and of 42 augmented imperfects recorded by Gehring, no less than 14, or one-third, take the head of the verse. Assuredly, one would not deny unusual vigor to K 229, 230, 231, and δ 334 = ρ 125 ἤθελον εὐνηθῆναι speaks for itself. Of the 28 imperfects which take their place elsewhere, not a small part belong to fixed phrases. ἤθελε θυμός occurs nine times at the end and ἤθελε θυμῷ four times. We really gain nothing by all this. More important is the preference for the negative with ἐθέλω, which can hardly have escaped the notice of any attentive reader of Greek. According to Mr. Higgins οὐ never occurs with βούλομαι in Homer. Rhythm may have something to do with this also, but as the same preference is shown throughout prose, it is fair to base on that an argument for the less aggressive character of ἐθέλω. The οὐκ ἐθέλω 'I am not willing' becomes stronger than βούλομαι by the Greek love of λιτότης, and we may neglect Mr. Higgins's metaphysical explanation. So βούλομαι, which in Dr. VAN CLEEF'S *Index Antiphonteus* occurs thirty-six times, has the negative but twice; ἐθέλω, with thirty-eight occurrences, has the negative eighteen times. But I must not let the suggestiveness of the two indexes carry me farther, and will simply emphasize the importance of these lists for the lightening of much-needed work in the language of the orators.

In the preface to the *Letters of James the Just in eight forms* (Boston, Ginn & Co.), President STRYKER speaks of this epistle as 'a piece of pure and elegant Greek.' He ought to have weighed his words more carefully, especially as his 'eight forms'—that is, the original and seven versions—seem to show that the edition was intended primarily for the comparative study of varying idioms. 'Purity and elegance' are not consistent with unclassic words, unclassic syntax, foreign phrases and a remarkable paucity of particles. The epistle may be 'thrilled with a passionate truthfulness and a commanding zeal that makes the rhetoric alive,' and it is doubtless an excellent textbook for Christian socialism, but the rhetoric is not Greek rhetoric, and the Grecian refutes to be comforted for the absence of μέν and for the scarcity of ἀλλά. μὴ οἰέσθω ὅτι and δοκεῖτε ὅτι strike one unpleasantly even if defensible at a pinch. ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζεται has, it is true, Ionic and Thukydeidean warrant, but γλώσσαν αὐτοῦ and καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, and the rest of the αὐτοῦ's, and προσωποληψία and εἰσελήλυθαι and προσευχῇ προσήγατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι can hardly be called, according to any standard, 'pure and elegant Greek.' And in fact nothing is gained by such extravagant claims. The divine message needs no such praise, and would only have been open to suspicion if it had been delivered by a mincing rhetorician in the best Attic the period afforded.

Mr. FORBES, who has presented the world with a handsome edition of the *First Book of Thukydides* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press; New York, Macmillan & Co.), seems to have no special qualification for the task. He is not a critic, as he frankly confesses, and he is not a grammarian, if one is to judge by the compilation called a 'Grammar of Thukydides,' which contains nothing that shows individual insight. Whether Mr. FORBES the critic, Mr. FORBES the grammarian, or Mr. FORBES the proof-reader is responsible for the blunder ἐξεῖσι for ἐξίησι (c. 46), which disfigures the text of the fair volume, does not appear. The chief interest of the book will be found to lie on the historical side, but the few notes the editor had to make might readily have been despatched in a brief article; and one rather dreads eight books of Thukydides on this scale and with this meagreness of results. Nothing could be more amateurish than the treatment of the writers of the age of Thukydides, among which writers Herodotos does not figure, although one problem to be resolutely grasped by the editor of Thukydides is the comparison of the two great historians, who during the formative stages were under very much the same set of influences, the influences which, for want of a better name, we call sophistic. The vindication of the trustworthiness of Thukydides, of late so ferociously impugned, is welcome, but here as elsewhere in the volume, one feels that the editor lacks the vocation, lacks the equipment demanded of a man who is to edit Thukydides on this scale.

In a little book which was popular thirty years ago and may, for aught I know, be popular now—*Day-dreams of a Schoolmaster* (p. 188)—Mr. D'ARCY W. THOMPSON amused himself by constructing a charade on *cornix*, a bird which he proceeds to identify with κόραξ. The slip is pardonable or not, according to one's standard in such matters. At all events, it is interesting to find a *Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York, Macmillan & Co.), dedicated to the elder D'ARCY W. THOMPSON by his son, who bears the same name and who looks at *cornix* and κόραξ with ornithological eyes. Of late years we have had several monographs on the birds of antiquity, LORENTZ on the dove, KELLER on the hawk, BAETHJEN on the cock, but nothing that rivals the completeness and erudition of Mr. Thompson's book, which will be welcome to every classical scholar. It is to be noted that Mr. THOMPSON is more shy of identification than some scholars, but this caution is natural in a Scotchman and a professor of natural history. On the other hand, however, he is much given to astronomic symbolism, and is prone to seek the birds of the air in the constellations of heaven. That is at all events a happier field than the regions of phallic mystery, and it is not surprising that, when he comes to κορώνη, he contents himself with a modest reference to the commentators on Pindar, P. 3, 19, where, it will be remembered, Boeckh apologizes for the *sordes* into which he has plunged. And yet the phallic interpretation seems to be inevitable. Comp. the oracle cited on O 4, 8: ἰστοβοῆμ γέροντι νέην ποτίβαλλε κορώνην, and the famous epigram of Archilochos:

σκῆ πετραίη πολλὰς βόσκουσα κορώνας (= πορνοβοσκάς)
εὐήθης ξείνων δέκτρια Πασιφίλῃ.

For similar use of bird-names see Bücheler, Arch. II 116; A. J. P. II 256.

There is generally more or less prejudice against collections of essays and studies, especially those that have already seen the light. Publishers, in this country at least, are shy of undertaking them; and no matter how carefully the papers may have been elaborated, they are supposed to have served their generation and to have fallen on sleep, a sleep that ought to know no waking. And as to the propriety of rousing them from that sleep, the public seems usually to be of the same mind as the publishers. But there are noteworthy exceptions. No more noble monument to an illustrious scholar, no more welcome addition to a student's apparatus than such a volume as HERMANN SAUPPE's *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Weidmannsche Buchhandlung), in which the famous *Epistola critica ad Godofredum Hermannum* shines forth, if not in the forefront of the book as a *πρόσωπον τηλανγές*, still as a *στρατιῆς ὀφθαλμός*. Such learning, such sanity, such simplicity can never become obsolete.—Another collection which is welcome in a different way is that which bears the title *Aus Altertum und Gegenwart* (Munich, Beck), by Professor PÖHLMANN, of Erlangen, author of an elaborate work, *Geschichte des antiken Kommunismus und Sozialismus*, the first volume of which appeared in 1893. The contents of these twelve essays, most of which were first published in the last three years, are sufficiently varied, but there is a common thought running through them all, and no student of antique life can read these fascinating studies without having his attention stimulated and his views widened. The study of ancient history is still too much a study of political and military movements: too little a study of the underlying operations of social and economic forces; and under Professor Pöhlmann's guidance, antiquity becomes a very modern and very instant thing. Even that rhetorical Turveydrop Isokrates becomes less forlorn and ceases to suggest the inevitable avoidance of *hiatus*.